



# BELARUS

UN General Assembly  
Sixty-Second Session  
Third Committee

## STATEMENT

in connection with the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Belarus (L.51)

This time **no procedural motion stood in the way of the debate on resolution on Belarus**. Whether this debate actually amounted to the fair consideration of a country human rights situation **on its merits** remains an open question. It is as open as a couple of other uneasy questions that linger.

Has this debate brought us any closer to the understanding of the concerns that the co-sponsors of this resolution have with regard to Belarus?

Has it made us more or less convinced about the appropriateness of this preferential mistreatment of my country?

Have the delegations been accorded the honour of receiving a **balanced and unprejudiced** assessment of the situation of human rights in Belarus?

Is this really how the co-sponsors see fair and balanced consideration of human rights situations – no dialogue, no engagement, no real debate? These questions sound to us pretty rhetorical.

One may call it a debate but, in the unfortunate Third Committee tradition, this is rather an exchange of statements. An exchange where we are much more preoccupied with making our own point than with perceiving that of others. The results of such 'engagement' do not fail to show in **the most divisive voting patterns** among all six main committees of the General Assembly. And this kind of voting – be it on the moratorium on death penalty or on country-specific harassment – this voting not just divides us but **it makes even the strongest argument and the most honourable concern regrettably devoid of the power to ignite a positive response, to encourage a dedicated following, to enact a change for the better.**

This time the co-sponsors will not have a convenient procedural excuse to explain the habitual absence of open and constructive engagement of the whole of the assembly in discussing the claims and allegations contained in their document. If anything had the debate stifled this time, it was our own ineptitude. It was our inability to make a sound judgment on **the adequate ways and methods of dealing with this kind of delicate situations.**

Even in the presence of a tangible alternative – I have in mind the universal periodic review – many of us still easily agree to be lulled into believing that **a shortcut on human rights** is possible. Why should we restrain ourselves, why should we really care about the proper procedures with regard to Belarus if we believe that it is righteous to nail them here and now?!

Whether this flaw in thinking and in action of some of us is a sincere delusion or a hypocritical **circumstantial adjustment of principles** in view of what is politically desired or expedient is not that much important.

What really matters is **where we go from here**. Do we continue to exaggerate our differences and disagreements escalating them to a major cultural and civilisational stand-off? Or do we manage to display some unthinkable qualities – of being patient, being humble, being tolerant, not preaching, being a partner one is eager to work with?

When a no action motion comes, we will all follow our governments' policies. But some of us will be lucky enough to follow our hearts as well.

If, after having spoken out, you still vote against this procedural motion, ask yourself an honest question – WHY?